G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1894-95

File No. 160-94

192

Serial Nos. 1 to 9

(2)

Later references.

LR 178-21 (1-7)
LR 230-23-(1,2)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Govt. Guaranteed Interest

Serial Nos. 1 to 9

50
2 nil

Part B for September 1896

SUBJECT.

Official correspondence relating to Loans raised for Irrigation Works and the Accounts thereof. Receipt and disbursement of Loan Funds. Transfer of Loan Funds between Treasuries. Arrears of Land Revenue.

R. & L. No.

Correspondence regarding Village Kantajeo Tank.

No. 3615 dated 16-9-1896.

Letter from Commissioner, Orissa Division, forwarding petition from Inhabitants of Village Kantajeo praying for grant of Rs. 1,000 for repairs to the Village Tank.

Received
4-8-21

WD 225—4 PS—20,000—14-6-20

(1)

(5)

Before the Government of ~~His Highness the Maharaja of~~ Mysore.

Appeal No. 186 of 94-95

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondent.
Sitaramiah		Gallaiah

Notice served.

13. 8. 95

~~Decision~~

Appl^t by Mr. L. Srinivasaiah

Resp^t by Mr. K. Venkatarama Iyer

Appl^t's Counsel heard

BO

13/8

The question raised in this case is very simple. One Gangappa was ~~convicted~~ charged & tried for cheating & general in matters of conspiracy and as the result of which he was the Shanbhag and was also charged with three specific charges he was called upon to furnish three securities, The brother appellants' father was one of the three who appointed after his death the present appellant was required

When the receipt will place
the respondent satisfied with and
in the order then passed the rights
of the present respondent were enough
secured. As between the present
appellant & the respondent that order
is binding and the appellant cannot
get behind it. The terms are clearly
stated and were based on the assumption
that Sangappa's rights were not forfeited
but that official Liquidators were the
appointed - the respondent was then a
minor and he sought this suit
by next friend. Both the lower
Courts have decreed the claim &
the decision appears to be correct.
There are precedents in which Hindus
guilty of serious offences have been
punished only during their life
their right being restored to their
heirs after their death - There is
nothing in this case to justify
any order which would result
in such a forfeiture & deprive
the respondent permanently of his
ancestral right - For these reasons
the orders appealed against are
confirmed & this appeal is dismissed

Wilkins Lumbers

To Abdul Rahman 23-1-96
21-1-96 Sd/- K.B. Abdul Rahman

Gen. Serial No. 32.]

1895

No. 2401 C. A. 160-94.

Name of Petitioner: [illegible]

Village: [illegible]

Taluk: Bangalore

District: [illegible]

Date of Arz: [illegible]

Date of Receipt: 12-6-94

Date of Disposal:

No. of Enclosures: 5

ABSTRACT.

[illegible]

Plaintiff's Bill of Complaint and the Defendant's Plea thereto and Demurrer thereto and Joinder in Demurrer

2- That the said Plea was filed on the 18th day of January A.D. 1888 and the said Demurrer and Joinder in Demurrer were filed on the 5th day of March A.D. 1888 respectively.

3- That on the hearing of the said Demurrer and Plea on the 6th day of March A.D. 1888 the Plaintiff's Counsel submitted that the Plea was bad in law and ought to be overruled with costs and the Defendant's Counsel submitted that the Plea was good in law and ought to be allowed with costs.

4- That the said Plea and Demurrer were argued on the 6th day of March A.D. 1888 and the Court reserved judgment.

5- That it is considered that the said Plea is bad in law and ought to be overruled with costs.

6- That it is considered that the Plaintiff is not barred by limitation from suing the Defendant for the said Trespass and Conversion and that the Plaintiff is not precluded from suing the Defendant for the said Trespass and Conversion by the Statute of Limitations.

7- That the said Plea of the Plaintiff's Estoppel was insufficient and bad in law, and ought to be overruled with costs to the Plaintiff.

8- That it is ordered that the proceedings in this cause be stayed until the Plaintiff has paid into Court the costs of the said Plea and Demurrer and Joinder in Demurrer and the costs of the Defendant's Counsel fee on the hearing of the said Plea and Demurrer.

Except that the Plaintiff may sue out a writ of Scire facias to revive the Judgment which was given in favour of the Plaintiff in the said Trespass and Conversion suit.

1916.

(1) 5

MYSORE COURT FEE

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. No. 3407R
DATE 18-6-95

34-1-
26-3-96

vll 11 6 95

A.S. 186 of 94-95

ವಿಷಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಮಿ ವಿ ಇ ಪಿ ಇ ಪಿ ಆಫೀಸು ನಂಬರ್

1894-95 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಕೌ ವಿ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಪೀಲು ನಂಬರ್

ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ದಿನ ಮತ್ತು ಆಫೀಸಿನವರು

ಮುಟ್ಟಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ದಿನ -

ಈ ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಅಪೀಲಿನ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು
ಇವರ 1894-95 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ 16 ನೇ ಶಿಸ್ತಿನ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಪೀಲು
ಬಿದ್ದಿದೆ ಅಪೀಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಕಾರಣಗಳು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ
ಎಂದು ಅಪೀಲನ್ನು ವಜಾ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ
ಅಪೀಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ -

ವಾದಿಯು ತಂದೆಯು 1876 ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸತ್ತಾಗ ವಾದಿಯು
ತಲೆಯ ಆದಾಯವಿದ್ದ ಸ್ವತ್ತುಗಳು ಸುಮಾರು ಬೆಲೆಯುಳ್ಳವಾಗಿದ್ದವು
ಆ 10 ಎಕರೆ ಸಸ್ಯಪಿಲೆ ತೋಟವು ಬೆಳೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ
ತಂದೆಯು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ತಿಪ್ಪೆಸ್ಥಾಂಗಳನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಉದ್ದು ಆಕಳ
ಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಗೆಗಳು ಆಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದವು ಇವನ್ನು
ಬೆಳೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣವು ಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದಿತು
ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಂದೆಯು ಸತ್ತಾಗ ವಾದಿಯು ತಂದೆಯ ಸಾಲವನ್ನು
ತೀರಿಸಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹಣವು ಉಳಿಯಿತು ಇದರಿಂದ ಮೇಲೆ
ಹೇಳಿದ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದನು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಹಣವು
ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲವಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವನು ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದನು -

ನಂಜರಂಗಪ್ಪನವರು 1878 ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೀರಿಕೊಂಡಾಗ
ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ತೀರಿಸಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ
ಹಣವು ಉಳಿಯಿತು ಇದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿದ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಿಗೆ
ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದನು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರ ಸ್ವಂತ ಆಸ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲದೆ
ಅವರ ಹೆಂಡತಿಯ ಆಸ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಸಹ ಅಡವಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ
ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯಾಗಿ ಅವರ ಹೆಂಡತಿಯವರು ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ
ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯಾಗಿ ಅವರ ಹೆಂಡತಿಯವರು ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ
ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯಾಗಿ ಅವರ ಹೆಂಡತಿಯವರು ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ



3. [illegible]

4- [illegible]

5. [illegible]

6- [illegible]

7- [illegible]

8- [illegible]

[redacted]perences

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 207
No.
10 JUL. 95
DEWAN'S OFFICE.

Gen. Serial No. 3[redacted]1

[redacted] to the Rev. Councillor
[redacted] orders.

[redacted]3/7

C.C.
Post expenses
Rs 8
18/7/95

C. Dewan II
10758

[redacted]e the Rep-[redacted] case [redacted]
[redacted]ct 13 August
[redacted] to [redacted]
24/7 Issued 25/7

From Deputy Commissioner
Tinnevelly District

L.R 160-94-3

To Revenue Secretary to the
Govt. of Mysore.

Dated 8th July 1895.
Despatched 9 —do—
Received

Enclosures No. 3 files sent separately by parcel post 11/7

General No. 20
No.

this Offl. Memo dt. Pet. 1933
of 25 June 1895.

Submitting the entire proceedings connected with Revenue appeal case No 16 of 1894-95 on the file of this Court regarding the Shanbogueship of Lagur and other Villages in the Koratagere Sub Taluk.

Petitioner
Rs 10/-/95

To be posted to Koratagere as in
[redacted] Commissioner to this

No. 20
3 files

(10) Tsinkiu District.
Deputy Commissioner's Office.
Tsinkiu 8th July 1895

To

The Revenue Secretary to
the Government of Mysore.

Sir,

As required in your Offi-
-cial Memo No Pct/1933 dated the
25th June 1895, I have the honor
to submit herewith the entire
proceedings connected with the
Revenue appeal case No 16 of
1894-95 on the file of this Court
regarding the Shanbogueship of
Saggéré and 25 other Villages in
the Koratagéré Sub Taluk. The
facts of the case are fully
stated in the Deputy Commis-
-sioner's Judgment.

2. The enclosures of the Official

Memo

ಬಾಕಿ ಸಹಿ ಹಾಕಿ ಬಾಕಿಯವರು.

18/6/85
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

(12)
6

L.R. 160-94-4.

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore

DR Vol II
10954

Read:—

(1) Petition of appeal No 3401/186 of 1894-95, presented by Sidvirayya of Madhavenkatāpura in the Kortāgere Talk; against the judgment of the Deputy commissioner of Tumkur in Revenue Appeal No 16 of 1894-95 confirming the decision ~~dismissing Petitioners appeal against the judgment~~ of the General Assistant-commissioner Tumkur in Revenue Original case No 11 of 1894-95

Plaintiff.
Mallaiya

Defendants
1 Gangappa
2 Hode Mallappa
3 Basanna
4 Sidvirayya
5 Rudraiya

(2) Records received with letter No 20 dated 9th July 1895 from the Deputy commissioner

Dumkur District, from which the facts of the case appear to be briefly as follow:—

Gangappa father of Plaintiff Mallappa, was the Shanbhog of 26 villages He was removed from the office in 1877, on the ground that he delayed remitting the Cash charges to the Treasury, and in his place three substitutes named by him, viz. the 2nd and 3rd Defendants and 4th Defendants' father were appointed for the three circles into which the Taluka was divided by the Survey Department. Two of these, (the 2nd & 3rd Defendants) were the brother and uncle of Gangappa. The third Sangappa, who was appointed as

Pet 1535

20-02-92 1-7-95 (3)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

L. Q 160-94-2

ORDER II 10952

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition No. 3401 dated 18-6-95 received at the Dewan's Office from Ledi-Craggs of Marnalinka-Tapal Kottigere Sub Taluk, Appealing against the order of Commissioner in Rev. appeal case no 16 of 1894-95 regarding the Phantgueship of Kaffee and 25 Mottlaps of the same Taluk is forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Tumkur District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case, together with a full report of the facts of the case, and on the points urged in the petition.

The petition with its enclosure should be returned.

By order,

Draft HBL 25/6

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE, 25-6-1895

Rev.

Rc's order PKR 25/6

M.G.C.P.B.—25-4-95—1,000

(11)

Memo under reply are here-
with returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obed.t Servant.
Mr Macaulay
Esq.. Act.g Commissioner
E.C.

8745 dt 20-3-96
P.J. 65-95 / 26.
Enc: 2 Ver files sent by parcel –

Order therein.

The question raised in this case is very simple. One G Anyappa was relieved of his duties for carelessness and general incompetency, and as the villages of which he was the Shanbhog had been split up into three separate charges, he was called upon to appoint three substitutes. The present appellant's father was one of the three thus appointed, and after his death, the present appellant was registered. When this succession took place, the Respondent's father objected to it and on the order then passed, the rights of the present Respondent

were expressly reserved. As between the present Appellant and the Respondent, that order is binding, and the Appellant cannot get behind it. The terms are clearly stated and were based on the assumption that Gingaffe's rights were not forfeited, but that efficient officiators (Gumasias) only were appointed. The Respondent was then a minor, and he brought this suit to establish his right. Both the Lower Courts have decreed the claim and the decision appears to be correct. For these reasons the orders appealed against are confirmed and the appeal dismissed

Redraft

[illegible] 20/3

[illegible] for Secretary

To the Deputy Comm
Tumkur Dis

Standing of Goldsmith and
Golden Village was disputed.
He died in 1875, and Marilyn
his son, the 4th defendant
was registered in his place.
In 1884, Gingerfish traded
for the removal of the 4th defendant
Granada and for the termination
of the office of him. The defendant
Committee held that Gingerfish
did not forfeit the rights
of his family, but that he
was estopped from claiming
the office himself and that
the registry in the name of
the 4th defendant should con-
tinue subject to the termi-
nation of any suit which Gingerfish
minor son (the present Plaintiff)
might institute on his attaining
majority.

23/6/96 2P Remarks

Ved Clone 4088

COURT FEE
Dy Govt Wks
21-6-96
Dr Kyrpungalmoodr
TWO RUPEES

Two Rupees Stamp affixed

(19

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. NR 4088R
DATE 23-6-96

In the Court of the Council
H. H. the Maharaja of
Mysore.

Appellant. Respondent.
Siddaviriah
(4th Defendant) Malliah.

Petition for the revision of the Government Order No. 8745 P. 7/65-95 of 20 March 96 on the following grounds.

1. That the Government have overlooked the fact that at the Survey Settlement, the appellants were appointed not as Gumastha but as permanent incumbents to the Kurral affairs-

2-3 The Government have further overlooked the fact that Gangappa is still alive, and that during his lifetime his heirs cannot contest their rights inasmuch as Gangappa will not be subject to the punishment inflicted on him in the event of any of

The Plaintiff instituted
this suit in February 94,
for the recovery of the office
from the Defendants 2, 3, 4
and 5. The 4 and 5th Defendant
alone contested the claim
in respect of the villages registered
in the 4th Defendant's name.
As 6 villages out of the 26
referred to above had been
since transferred to the
Godaliyan Taluk of the
Bangalore District, the Assistant
Commissioner Tumkur who
tried the suit left them out
of consideration, and as regards
the remaining 20 villages gave
a decree in favour of Plaintiff.
This decree was affirmed in
appeal by the Deputy Com-
missioner Tumkur District.
Hence the second appeal by
the 4th Defendant.

References

24/6/96

6 of 96

Wale 2/6 Tp file

GOVERNMENT

The fresh petition

26/6

This is an application for review of an order passed by the Asst Collector

Petitioner suffers

Return petn saying that 5 Rs. Stamp Stamp is appeal.

SS 29/6/96

Endorsed on Petn

1-7-96

Resubmitted with 5 Rupees stamp affixed. Application for review of an order passed in the 2nd and 3rd appellants

28/7/96

189

No. 40.88 L.Q 1894

Name of Petitioner, Sidhanisah

Village,

Taluk, Erode

District,

Date of Arzi, 10.9.96

Date of Receipt, 23-6-96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure,

ABSTRACT.

This is a petition for the revision of an Order No. 8-7-1 of 96 of 20 March 96. The petition is unstamped and is returned

2-7-96

2 was the Shanbhog of 26 villages. He was removed from the office in 1877, on the ground that he delayed remitting the Bandh charges to the Treasury, and in his place three substitutes named by him, viz the 2nd and 3d Defendants and 4th Defendant's father were appointed for the three circles into which the Taluka was divided by the survey Department. Two of these (the 2nd and 3d Defendants) were the brother and uncle of Gangappa. The third Gangappa who was appointed as shanbhog of Gollahalli and 9 other villages was a stranger. He died in 1878 and thereupon his son, the 4th Defendant, was registered in his place. In 1884 Gangappa prayed for the removal of the 4th Defendant's Gumasta and for the restoration of the office to him. The Deputy Commissioner held that Gangappa did not forfeit the rights of his family, but that he was stopped from claiming the office himself, and that the registry in the name of the 4th Defendant should continue subject to the result of any suit which Gangappa's minor son (the present plaintiff) might institute on his attaining majority

2/ [illegible] (20)

4 [illegible]

Dated 23rd June/96
Bangalore

OFFICE OF THE
JL. 96
DEVELOPMENT OFFICER

[illegible]

By order

[illegible]

Secretary

A.S.

Reg

three substitutes. The present Appellant's (24)
father was one of the three thus appointed, and
after his death, the present Appellant was
registered. When this succession took place,
the Respondent's father objected to it, and in
the order then passed the rights of the present
Respondent were expressly reserved. As
between the present Appellant and the
Respondent, that order is binding, and
the appellant cannot get behind it. The
terms are clearly stated, and were based
on the assumption that Gangappa's
rights were not ~~forfeited~~ forfeited but
that efficient officiators (Gumastas)
only were appointed. The Respondent
was then a minor, and he brought
this suit to establish his right.
Both the Lower Courts have decreed
the claim and the decision
appears to be correct. For these reasons
the orders appealed against are



(21)

Proceedings of the Government of Sabaragamuwa

Read:-

(1) Petition of appeal No 340/186 of 1896-95 presented by Sitiraija of Madawala Kalpura in the Ratnapura Talukā against the judgment of the Deputy Commissioner of Tamils in Tamil appeal No 6 of 1894-95 confirming the decision of the General Assistant Commissioner, Tamil District in Tamil original case No 11 of 1894-95

Plaintiff

Mallaiya

vs

Defendants.

Ganga Appu

2 Podi Mallappa

3 Bataraa

4 Sidaraiya

5 Radaraiya.

(2) Papers received with letter No 20 dated 9th July 1896 from the Deputy-Commissioner, Tamil District from which the facts of the case appear to be briefly as follows:—

Ganga Appu father of plaintiff Mallaiya

20-03-96

26-3-96

(1)

DR Vol II / 10955

3401/186/3

L.Q.1666-94-6

3/ (23)

2 The plaintiff initiated this suit in February 1874 for the recovery of the office from the Defendants 2, 3, 4 and 5. The 4th and 5th Defendants alone contested the claim in respect of the villages registered in the 4th Defendant's name. 4 villages ~~registered~~ out of the 26 referred to above had been since transferred to the Subdivision Court of the Bangalore District, the Assistant Commissioner of Tumkur who tried the suit left them out of consideration, and as regards the remaining 22 villages gave a decree in favour of Plaintiff. This decree was affirmed in appeal by the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District since this second appeal by the 4th Defendant.

Order thereon. P. 8145 Exhibits P.P. 35-45 sealing parcel

Dated Bangalore 24th March 1876.

The petition raised in this case is very simple. One Gangappa was relieved of his duties for carelessness and general incompetency and as the villages of which he was the Shanbhog had been split up into three separate charges he was called upon to appoint

References

P. F. 65795

27/7

The p.c. is putting up

3/8

Attended to.

6/8

Application for review of order passed by the 2nd J.C. Committee—

In time

Stamp supplied

Submitted for orders

Mr. Caseway will consider whether the order in revision should be allowed to remain as it was passed.

23/8/96

1896

No. 345

Name of Petitioner, Subbaverich

Village, A. Q. 160-96-7.

Taluk,

District,

Date of Arzi, 20.7.96

Date of Receipt, 23.7.96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, /

ABSTRACT.

Prays for revision of Govt order No 8745-P.7.94-95 of 20th March/96. Acts per Govt order No 4088 of 30.6.96 he has affixed 5Rd stamp to his petn

Revn petn is in English.

C.S.K.

24.7.96

57 Confirmed and this appeal dismissed 25

(Sd) C. Sreenivasiengar

To Secretary.

The Deputy Commissioner

Tumkur District with

Records 27-3-96

Copy applied for on 17-4-96

-do- ready — 18-4-96

-do- delivered — 19-4-96

No of words 655.

Copying and comparing

fee — 4 — 12-10.

Ch. Lakshmanarasu

Revenue Clerk

alive, and that during his lifetime his heirs cannot contest their rights inasmuch as they appa will not be subject to the punishment inflicted on him in the event of any of his heirs being appointed to the Shanbhogship.

4 The 4th appellant Siddaveeriah prays that the foregoing facts may be considered and justice done to him.

5 That in case the Govt were still to be of opinion after considering the above facts, that the Respondent Imalliah should be the Shanbhog for the three Firkas, the appellant Siddaveeriah Solicits that Orders may be issued to the Deputy Commissioner to let the Respondent continue as Shanbhog for the Firka he is at present employed, instead of the Respondent allowing Imalliah employing another Man as he, his father Sungappa and his grandfather have given Satisfaction in the discharge of their duties since the year 1865.

Dated Bangalore
20th July 96

(24)

By order

Draft

Secretary

11/3





(30)

31/5
Court Fee

Stamps to the Value of Rupees five ~~only~~ affixed

In the Court of the Commissioner & Deputy Secretary to Government

-Rajah of Mysore -

(9)

Petn by
16 Feb Proceedings
23/7/96

Appellant	Respondent	Reference No.
Siddaveerah (4th defendant)	Mallah	65

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
RECD. No 345-R
DATE 23-7-96

Petition for the execution of the Govt order No S-45 of 1 65-95-6 dated 20th March 96 on the following grounds

1 That the Govt have overlooked the fact that at the time of petitioners the appellants were appointed not as Gumastas but as permanent incumbents to the several offices.-

2 That the commutation of the defendants to the three Firkas as Shanbhogs was confirmed by the Deputy Commissioner on the 8th June 77 ~~and this fact~~ as solicited by the respondents father vide ~~on the~~ 28th March 77 and this fact is solicited by the appellant to be taken into consideration

3 The Govt have further overlooked the fact that Gangadhaiah is still alive -

(10)

(32) 14-9-96

L.Dis.160-96-A

Dr. Well II
10/9/96

Reference Circuit 6/2/97

34 of 95

DF 65 of 95

Stamp

12/2/97 Petitioner

to Respondents

Date when Petitioner

in the case applied for

Order No 8745 dated 3rd

Dr. 1895

Amount originally

been on 2033 Rs

13/2/97 Paid

M 15/2/97

10-11-97 Petitioner

No-03-97

2/3/97

Acknowledgment

on 6/3/97

(33)

1897

No. 2562

Name of Petitioner, Shivappa Hallikeri

Village 1900-94-7

Taluka

District Dharwar

Date of Petition

Date of Receipt

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 2 Stamped blank papers

ABSTRACT-

Shivappa Hallikeri Petitioner in Civil Suit No 1896 of 1894-95 pending in the Court of Munsiff Kundgol praying for Stamped blank papers and is prepared to pay the necessary fee on receipt of the copy applied

BL 11/2



(34)

2-56

To Copy Br
with 8 annas stamp
6/2/97

6/2/97

Before the Court of the Subordinate
Judge at Mysore
Revenue Appeal Case
No 186 of 1894-95



Appellant
Respondent

Vs Malleah

The Respondent prays that a Certified Copy of the Decree of the Court may be Granted to him he has herewith produced one Court-fee of Rupee & Eight annas for the same he is prepared to pay the Copying fee

6-2-1897

Respondent